

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-37 remain pending in the application. Claims 1-18 were previously cancelled. Claims 19, 24 and 34-35 have been amended to improve claim language. Claim 36 has been rewritten in independent form. New claim 37 has been added.

Figs. 1A and 1B are objected to because of informalities. In response, Figs. 1A and 1B have been labeled as "Prior Art", therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 19, 20, 24, 25, and 27-36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syms et al (US Patent 4,746, 082 A) in view of Woodland (US 5,927,648 A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 19 recites the optronics elements and the target line orientation and stabilization mechanism being directly incorporated in the module forming a section. Syms fails to disclose or suggest the claimed feature above. Specifically, Syms appears to disclose that a central section is stabilized and oriented as shown in Fig. 3 by a trim motor 17 (regarded by the Examiner as the claimed stabilization mechanism) that mounted outside the section. (See, Fig. 2 of Syms). Therefore, Syms does not disclose or suggest that the claimed stabilization mechanism is directly incorporated in the module forming a section, as recited in claim 19.

Further, claim 19 also recites that the second optronics element is a laser source mounted on the outside of the following cowl in a space of the module forming a section, accessible through a hatch formed in the module, which is not disclosed or suggested by the applied art. In particular, Woodland appears to disclose optronics elements, e.g., sensors (regarded by the Examiner as the claimed laser source) housed in a pod assembly, the pod assembly being adapted for deployment from the interior of the aircraft to the exterior of the aircraft through the aircraft door as shown in Fig. 8 of Woodland. The Woodland system is a modular having more than one pod as shown in Fig. 7. Additional,

the “rapid access” applies to the pod which can be accessed through the aircraft door but does not apply to the optronics elements which are fixed in the pod. Therefore, Woodland fails to disclose or suggest the laser source being accessible through a hatch formed in the module.

Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above, even if the applied references were combined, the resulting combination would not achieve claim 19. Claim 19 should be patentable over the applied art and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 36 has been rewritten in independent form and recites the similar features to claim 19, e.g., “stabilization mechanism being directly incorporated in the module forming a section”; “the second optronics element is a laser source mounted on the outside of the following cowl in a space of the module forming a section, accessible through a hatch formed in said module”. Claim 36 should be patentable for at least the reasons discussed with respect to claim 19.

Furthermore, claim 36 recites that a mechanical structure is designed to be an interface with a carrier, and the interface is mechanically rigid, which is not disclosed or suggested by the applied art. Syms “interface” can rotate around the aircraft axis to maintain the roll attitude substantially constant. (See, Syms, column 4, lines 44-64).

Accordingly, claim 36 should be patentable over the applied art and this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 21-23, 26 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syms et al. (US Patent 4,746,082 A) in view of Johnson et al. (US Patent 6,424,804 B1). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claims 21-23, 26 depend upon claim 19 and should be patentable over the applied art for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 19. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Newly added claim 37 recites “said interface is mechanically rigid”, which is not disclosed or suggested by the applied art for the reasons presented above. Claim 37 depends upon claim 19 and should be patentable over the applied art for the reasons

advanced with respect to claim 19 as well as on its own merits.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: March 6, 2009
KMB/CY/cac